

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1, 2, and 7-26 are currently pending. Claims 1, 18, 21, and 24 are independent. Claims 1, 7, 18, 21, and 24 and are hereby amended. No new matter has been introduced. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed.

Changes to the claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. SUPPORT FOR THE AMENDMENTS

Support for the amendments herein is found in the Published Application par. [0118]:

“[0118] In one implementation, a peer system can belong to multiple peer-to-peer relay networks. Each grid can be related or independent. The connections established according to each grid can be independent. Accordingly, **a peer can be connected to one peer in one grid but not in another (even though the two peers are both in both grids)**. In one implementation, if two peers are connected in two grids, the peers use a single connection. A message includes information indicating to which grid the message belongs. A peer relays a received message according to the connections established corresponding to the indicated grid for the message.” (emphasis added)

III. CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claim 7 was objected to for informalities.

Claim 7 has been amended to overcome the objection..

IV. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§102 AND 103

Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-13, and 16-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0184310 of Traversat et al. (hereinafter, merely "Traversat");

Claims 3, and 14-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Traversat in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,487,600 to Lynch; and

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Traversat and Lynch in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,240,093 to Danieli et al. (hereinafter, merely "Danieli")

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Independent claim 1 is representative and recites, *inter alia*:

"a first peer-to-peer relay network . . . including a first particular peer system and a second particular peer system;

...

a second peer-to-peer relay network . . . including the first particular peer system and the second particular peer system; and

...

wherein the first particular peer system has a connection to the second particular peer in the first peer-to-peer relay network and the first particular peer system does not have a connection to the second particular peer in the second peer-to-peer relay network"
(emphasis added)

Claim 1 recites, "a first peer-to-peer relay network . . . including a first particular peer system and a second particular peer system . . . a second peer-to-peer relay network . . .

including the first particular peer system and the second particular peer system; and wherein the first particular peer system has a connection to the second particular peer in the first peer-to-peer relay network and the first particular peer system does not have a connection to the second particular peer in the second peer-to-peer relay network.”

That is, in the invention as claimed in claim 1, there is a main network that includes ALL of the peers systems in the P2P network. The main network has two sub-networks made up of peers in the main network: a first sub-network and a second sub-network.

The first and second sub-networks have two peer systems in common: a first particular peer system and a second particular peer system.

The first particular peer system **is connected** to the second particular peer system in the first sub-network and, as distinguished from Traversat, the first particular peer system **is not connected** to the second particular peer system in the second sub-network. Publ. App. par. [0118].

The Office Action points to Traversat's FIG. 33 and pars. [0131-0133] for the peer-to-peer connections in Traversat. However, while Traversat's peer systems may be in multiple sub-networks, there is no suggestion that two peers are connected in one sub-network and not connected in another sub-network.

Lynch and Danieli do not add the elements missing from Traversat.

Claim 1 is believed patentable over Traversat, Lynch, and Danieli because those references taken alone or in combination do not teach, suggest, or render predictable each and every element recited in the claim.

For reasons similar or somewhat similar to those described above with regard to independent claim 1, independent claims 18, 24 and 26 are also believed to be patentable.

V. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims are dependent from one of the claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1, 2, and 7-26 are in condition for allowance. In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference, or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By: 

Paul A. Levy
Reg. No. 45,748
(212) 588-0800